Application No.: 10/522,166

Reply to the Office Action dated: April 5, 2006

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

In the present invention, a liquid composition is used which comprises

- (a) 1 to 6% by mass of hydrogen peroxide,
- (b) 0.5 to 10% by mass of a compound of the following formula (1):

$$R^{1}$$
– $(OR^{2})_{x}G_{y}$ (1)

wherein R¹ represents a linear or branched C8 to C16 alkyl group, R² represents a C2 to C4 alkylene group, G represents a residue derived from a reducing sugar, x is an average number of 0 to 6, and y is an average number of 1 to 10,

- (c) 1 to 20% by mass of polyoxyalkylene alkyl ether, wherein the carbon number of the alkyl group is 10 to 14 and the mole number of oxyalkylene added on the average is 7 to 12, and
 - (d) water,

wherein the ratio of (b)/(c) by mass is from 1/10 to 2/1.

In contrast, JP 02238098A (Soi et al/Kao Corp.) JP-A-156293 (<u>Takanashi et al/Kao Corp.</u>) and JP 09-104898 (<u>Miyamae et al/Lion Corp.</u>) fail to disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Soi et al do not disclose component (c) as claimed. In addition, Soi et al teach away from using amounts of alkyl glycoside which are higher than 5%. Soi et al show that, when the amount of an alkyl glycoside is more than 5%, storage stability is bad and a granule product has no good powder property.

Takanashi et al disclose that either an alkyl glycoside or a polyoxyethylene alkyl ether are used. See paragraph [0012]. However, there is no disclosure of a combination of both materials. Further, there is no disclosure of the claimed carbon number of the alkyl group

Application No.: 10/522,166

Reply to the Office Action dated: April 5, 2006

and the average added mole number of the oxyalkylene unit in the polyoxyethylene alkyl ether. The polyoxyethylene alkyl ether is not used in the Example of <u>Takanashi et al</u>. See paragraph [0020].

Takanashi et al suggest nothing about combination of components (b) with (c) of the invention. It merely shows, in [0013], that foaming is attained by combination of a surfactant with a hydrotope agent. It shows a powder composition in [0022] in which polyoxyethylene (20) stearyl ether is added as a binder for granules of succinic anhydride.

Finally, <u>Miyamae et al</u>'s compound IV containing methyl glycoside is different from the claimed compound of formula (1).

In addition, superior properties of the claimed compositions are disclosed in the Examples of the specification.

Example 1 is according to the present invention. In Comparative Example 1, b-1 was replaced with c-1. See page 29, last paragraph of the specification. [b-1: alkyl polyglucoside (the carbon number of the alkyl group, 12; degree of condensation of glucoside on the average, 1.3); c-1: polyoxyethylene lauryl ether (mole number of EO added on the average, 8)].

Table 1 at page 30 of the specification shows that a much higher degree (at least about 20% higher) of bleaching can be obtained using the product of the present invention (Example 1 compared to Comparative Example 1). In addition, the use of a foam works better than the use of a solution via a syringe.

Table 2 at page 31 of the specification also shows that a much higher degree (about 54% higher) of bleaching can be obtained using the product of the present invention (Example 2 compared to Comparative Example 2). Notably, in Comparative Example 2, the ratio of b/c is 2.25 and thus outside the claimed scope. In addition, the use of a foam works better than compositions that are not foamed (Comparative Examples 3 and 4).

Application No.: 10/522,166

Reply to the Office Action dated: April 5, 2006

These superior properties are not disclosed or suggested by Soi et al, Takanashi et al

or Miyamae et al, alone or in combination.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over JP 02238098A

(Soi et al/Kao Corp.) and further in view of JP-A-5156293 (Takanashi et al/Kao Corp.) and

JP 09-104898 (Miyamae et al/Lion Corp.) is believed to be unsustainable as the present

invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully

requested.

The objection to Claim 5 is obviated by the amendment of this claim.

Furthermore, all inventors designated in this application were employees of Kao

Corporation and under obligation to assign the results of their research to Kao Corporation at

the time the invention was made.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly

requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or

otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed

representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding

this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D

Registration No.: 47,297